

REMARKS

In this response, claims 1-4, 7-9, 16, 19, 22 have been amended. No claims have been added and no claims have been canceled. Accordingly, claims 1-17, 19, and 21-30 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration of the above-identified patent application is hereby requested.

WITHDRAWAL OF ALLOWABILITY OF CLAIMS 22-23

The Examiner has indicated that the allowability of claims 22-30 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference(s) to Stufa et al. (EP 0076237). Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider the withdrawal of these claims based on the remarks and amendments presented in this response.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over Bankston (U.S. Pat. No. 3,545,143). Specifically, the Examiner asserted that: "Bankston discloses a display; a plurality of screening rooms, wherein each screening room includes a view of the display; a movie playback system; and a sound distribution system coupled to receive audio signals from the movie playback system and to distribute the audio signals to the plurality of screening rooms, wherein each

Amendment Dated June 06 2005
In Reply to Office Action Dated
January 4, 2005

-11-

Appl. No. 10/715,939
Atty. Docket No. 64117-5001

screening room is effectively acoustically isolated, col. 2 lines 3-49."

In addition, the Examiner also rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hayashi (U.S. Pat. No. 5,611,174). Specifically, the Examiner asserted that: "Hayashi discloses a display; a plurality of screening rooms, wherein each screening room includes a view of the display; a movie playback system; and a sound distribution system coupled to receive audio signals from the movie playback system and to distribute the audio signals to the plurality of screening rooms, wherein each screening room is effectively acoustically isolated, col. 4 line 65 - col. 5 line 33."

Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejection is requested in view of the amendments and addition made to the claims and of the following discussion.

It is axiomatic that for a reference to be anticipatory, each and every feature in the claims must be disclosed by the single reference. Neither Bankston nor Hayashi anticipate the features present in the currently amended claim 19 to include "a soundtrack quality review system comprising controls to control the playback of the audio signals to determine the quality of the audio signals from the movie playback system." The claimed invention allows reviewers to review multiple soundtracks for quality issues simultaneously, without having to playback the movie once for each soundtrack to

be reviewed, as previously required in prior art reviewing techniques.

In view of the foregoing discussion and the amendments made to the claims, Applicant submits that the § 102(b) rejections are overcome. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102(b) rejections be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 22-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over European Patent No. 0076237, issued to Stufa et al. Specifically, the Examiner has asserted that: "Stufa et al. discloses a soundtrack distribution system comprising: a plurality of soundtrack processors, each providing an audio signal, pages 3 lines 6-9; an audio distribution router, ref. 6, coupled to receive the audio signals generated by the plurality of soundtrack processors, page 3 lines 9-17; and a plurality of audio switching devices, ref. 11 and 12, coupled (wirelessly) to the audio distribution router, page 3 lines 18-20. Stufa et al. discloses a plurality of inputs coupled to the plurality of soundtrack processors, page 3 lines 9-11; and a plurality of outputs coupled to the plurality of audio switching device, page 3 lines 22-25 (the modulated frequency for each soundtrack); wherein the audio distribution router is configured to selectively route the plurality of inputs to the plurality of outputs, page 3 line 25 - page 4 line 1 (selectively routes the inputs by transmitting them at different frequencies)."

Amendment Dated June 06 2005
In Reply to Office Action Dated
January 4, 2005

-13-

Appl. No. 10/715,939
Atty. Docket No. 64117-5001

Applicant respectfully submits that Stufa does not disclose, anticipate or suggest the limitation recited in amended claim 22 of "the plurality of audio switching devices being switched to control the playback of the audio signals from a respective soundtrack processor in the plurality of soundtrack processors to review the quality of the audio signal." As discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 19, the soundtrack review system provided by Applicant provides for the review of a movie print with multiple soundtracks simultaneously for quality issues. Stufa does not anticipate or suggest the application of a switching audio system for this type of system.

Applicant notes that as independent claim 22 contain the above described soundtrack review limitation and dependent claims 23-30, by virtue of depending on this independent claim, also recite the same limitation. Therefore these claims are allowable for the same reasons as discussed above.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is requested in view of the amendments and addition made to the claims and of the following discussion.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-15 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Bankston in view of Stufa et al. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that: "Bankston discloses displaying on a movie print on a display screen; providing a plurality of acoustically isolated screening rooms,

Amendment Dated June 06 2005
In Reply to Office Action Dated
January 4, 2005

-14-

Appl. No. 10/715,939
Atty. Docket No. 64117-5001

each with a view of the display screen controls for controlling the playback of the movie audio; and transmitting a generated audio signals to the screening rooms, col. 2 lines 3-49. Bankston does not disclose wherein the movie contains multiple soundtracks and wherein a different generated audio signal is transmitted to at least two of the screening rooms. Stufa discloses displaying a movie with multiple soundtracks and wherein a different generated audio signal is transmitted to at least two viewers, page 1 line 16 - page 2 line 7. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to realize that the theater of Bankston could be used to display movies with multiple soundtracks as taught by Stufa and thus instead of transmitting a soundtrack to a specific individual to small groups of individuals such as families located in their private booths. This would be done per the teachings of Stufa to allow viewing of films projected in several languages contemporaneously and thus increase business through the attraction of foreign language individuals. Each room could receive only one audio signal, such a room for Spanish, French, etc. or each room could receive all audio signals so that any language speaking group could use any room."

In addition, the Examiner has rejected claims 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kohut et al. (US 5327182), supplied by applicant, in view of Bankston (US 35451 43). Specifically, the Examiner asserts that: "Kohut et al. discloses a method of displaying a movie print on a display

Amendment Dated June 06 2005
In Reply to Office Action Dated
January 4, 2005

-15-

Appl. No. 10/715,939
Atty. Docket No. 64117-5001

screen with multiple soundtracks, col. 3 lines 45-47 and col. 3 line 66 - col. 4 line 2; generating separate audio signals from each soundtrack, col. 4 lines 27; transmitting one or more of the audio signals to one screening room, col. 4 lines 28-34. Kohut et al. does not disclose providing a plurality of screening rooms, each with a view of the display screen. Bankston discloses providing a theater system with a plurality of screening rooms, each with a view of the display screen, col. 2 lines 3-11 and fig. 2, and wherein the plurality of screening rooms are acoustically isolated from each other, col. 2 lines 44-59. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the method of displaying a multiple soundtrack film as taught by Kohut et al. in a viewing environment that has a plurality of screening rooms as taught by Bankston. This would be done per the teachings of Bankston to provide an improvement to the traditional theater viewing system to now allow individuals or small groups to watch a movie without being disturbed by other patrons of the theater, col. 1 lines 23-39."

Applicant notes that independent claims 1, 8, 9, 16, 19 and 21 contain the soundtrack/audio signal review limitation described by Applicant with regards to the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection. The claims that depend on these independent claims, by virtue of depending on these independent claims, also contain the same limitation. As the references do not, alone or in combination, teach or suggest this limitation, Applicant submits

Amendment Dated June 06 2005
In Reply to Office Action Dated
January 4, 2005

-16-

Appl. No. 10/715,939
Atty. Docket No. 64117-5001

that these claims are allowable for the same reasons as discussed above.

In view of the foregoing discussion, Applicant submits that the § 103 rejections are overcome. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully submitted,

JEFFER, MANGELS, BUTLER & MARMARO LLP

Dated: June 6, 2005

By: 

George G.C. Tseng, Esq.
Reg. No. 41,355
1900 Avenue of the Stars
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90067-4308
(310) 203-8080
Customer No. 24,574

GCT/ke1

Amendment Dated June 06 2005
In Reply to Office Action Dated
January 4, 2005

-17-

Appl. No. 10/715,939
Atty. Docket No. 64117-5001

3426900v1